

# DRAFT

**TOWN OF GILBERT  
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
GILBERT, AZ  
DECEMBER 6, 2017**

**COMMISSION PRESENT:** Vice Chairman Brian Andersen  
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield  
Commissioner David Cavenee  
Commissioner Greg Froehlich  
Commissioner Brian Johns  
Commissioner Joshua Oehler  
Alternate Commissioner Seth Banda  
Alternate Commissioner Daniel Cifuentes

**COMMISSION ABSENT:** Chairman Kristofer Sippel

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gilbert Olgin, Planner II  
Amy Temes, Senior Planner  
Nathan Williams, Senior Planner  
Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer  
Planning Manager Linda Edwards

**ALSO PRESENT:** Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson  
Attorney Nancy Davidson  
Recorder Debbie Frazey

---

## CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Brian Andersen called the December 6 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:08 p.m. Vice Chair Andersen invited Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson to administer the Oath of Office to Alternate Commissioner Seth Banda and Alternate Commissioner Daniel Cifuentes. Council Liaison Peterson then administered the Oath of Office. After administering the Oath of Office, she asked the new Alternate Commissioner Daniel Cifuentes to tell the Commission and the audience a little about himself. Daniel Cifuentes briefly introduced himself.

**1. DR17-1164, SAN TAN PAVILIONS PHASE IV, SANDBAR: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.44 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SANTAN VILLAGE PARKWAY AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROAD AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Amy Temes began her presentation on Item 1, DR17-1164, Sandbar Mexican Grill. She stated that this was a 0.44 acre site and was located at the intersection of Williams Field Road and Santan Village Parkway. She shared the Master Site Plan and the Preliminary Site Plan. She noted that Sandbar is an indoor/outdoor restaurant. She noted that the patio seating area is larger than the inside seating area. She said they have outside games and activities and festival lighting in the patio area. She said the site has shared parking and they are substantially over the minimum requirements for parking. She indicated that the indoor and outdoor seating for the restaurant was 10,784 square feet. She discussed some of the first review comments, specifically mentioning concerns about the garbage dumpster, as well as sidewalk connectivity. She said both of these items could be easily addressed. She shared the landscape plan, pointing out that the applicant wished to make a slight modification to the landscape plan currently shown. She discussed grading and drainage. She shared the Colors and Materials Board. Planner Temes then shared the Building Elevations. She called attention to the use of wood paneled louvers on the west side. She said these panels are open so that wind can blow through and a person walking by, could glimpse inside of the building. She pointed out the location of some artwork by the front door, noting that Staff does not approve art. She mentioned that Staff had some concerns with the south elevation. She called attention to the use of score joints, noting that they can easily get lost once you are out on the roadway and also pointing out that it doesn't articulate very well. She asked for input from the Commission about whether they felt the south elevation was articulated enough. She also requested input regarding the louvered wall system with the wood, as well as input regarding the overall architecture. She discussed the Lighting Plan. She told the Commission that the applicant had requested Construction Documents At-Risk. She said because this is within a Master Site Plan and does not require public notice, Staff has the ability, if there are no significant concerns with the project, to approve this application administratively. She said this would mean that the case would not come back before the Commission. Planner Temes finished her presentation.

Vice Chair Andersen thanked Amy Temes for her presentation and called for questions or comments from the Commission.

**Commissioner Greg Froehlich declared a Conflict of Interest on Item 1, DR17-1164**

Question: Commissioner Joshua Oehler said his main issue was with the south elevation and how big of a blank wall it is. He said he doesn't want to clutter the wall, but he wondered if they could turn the CMU wall that they have on the other side, and possibly break it up and bring it across. He also suggested taking the vertical elements to give some interest to that wall, because it would be seen fairly heavily from the right-of-way. He said his concern regarding the wood louvered wall system was in regard to the landscape. He said the site plan shows a 5' landscape

area. He said to get a full canopy tree, like the one showing on the site plan, would be very difficult. He said it would be very difficult for a tree to grow in that small area and he is concerned in time, the trees won't have an opportunity to grow, and they will cut them down and then they will have one big slab of wood. He suggested another alternative portion of landscape that they could offer in that area, mentioning the possibility of vines, to get some verticality in the landscaping.

Answer: Amy Temes said that the applicant had Orange Jubilee listed as one of their plants. She said the Orange Jubilee or Yellow Bell shrubs get quite tall, and she asked if he would be open to the use of a large shrub in the area. She asked if he preferred to solve the problem with landscape or if he preferred to solve it architecturally.

Response: Joshua Oehler said he wanted to allow the applicant to make that decision as he didn't want to take away from their design. He said that he thought the building as a whole was a good design.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked how long the Yellow Bells took to mature into a significant height.

Answer: Amy Temes said they were very fast growing.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said that they couldn't tell the applicant how to grow their plants, but he desired to get some verticality into the landscape. He said he was seeing some anomalies between the civil plan and the landscape plan. He said it looks like the trash enclosure protrudes out into the 25' driveway. He suggested the applicant look at and coordinate the engineering with their architectural, because they don't currently have a truly accessible route that comes from the right-of-way to the building.

Comment: David Cavenue said he had visited another Sandbar restaurant in the valley. He said he enjoyed his experience there. He said he doesn't mind the exterior at all and thinks it will be a nice look and feel from the corner. He also said he thinks it will be a good fit.

Seeing no further comments or questions, Vice Chair Andersen asked Planner Temes if she was comfortable with the information they had provided.

Planner Temes said she was comfortable with the input she had received, noting that she would like to approve the project administratively, after the issues have been resolved.

**2. DR17-1175, GILBERT RIVULON CAR DEALERSHIP: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.59 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF GILBERT AND PECOS ROADS AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Gilbert Olgin began his presentation on DR17-1175, Gilbert Rivulon Car Dealership. He indicated that the parcel size was 4.59 acres and was located south of the corner of Gilbert and Pecos Roads. He said the site was zoned Regional Commercial (RC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD). He shared the site plan, noting the location of a planned Volvo Dealership

that had already been approved. He pointed out where each of the two dealerships would be located. He noted the location of a proposed cul-de-sac that would face Gilbert Road. He said there is also a second building that is being proposed. He said the proposed project has a 1-story and a 2-story building that equal approximately 37,000 square feet. He said they are proposing 245 parking spaces. He indicated that the majority of those spaces would be for inventory in the back. He said the site has three points of access, one off of Gilbert Road and two off of Pecos. Planner Olgin said that the applicant had proposed some minor changes to the parking layout. He said the customer parking would be in the front and face Gilbert Road. He also pointed out the display areas for the new vehicles, not only inside of the dealership, but within some of the parking areas. He said they have proposed exterior landscaping on the outside of the site. He shared the location of the service area. He said there is an adequate fire lane access for emergency vehicles throughout the site. Planner Olgin shared the Landscape Plan and the Elevations. He pointed out the use of a silver mesh material. He said that the idea was to represent the streamlined look of a luxury car. He indicated that Staff didn't have any major issues with the design. He then shared the floor plans and the colors and materials.

Vice Chair Andersen thanked Gilbert Olgin for his presentation and called for questions or comments from the Commission.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked to see the site plan. He asked for some details about the display area located on the northeast corner. He asked if a landscape island was required for every eight parking spots when the use is for auto storage.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said he didn't know the answer, but could find out.

Comment: Joshua Oehler called attention to a specific parking spot located on a corner, noting that it would be really hard to get in and out of the last parking spot. He said he thought the applicant might want to take a look at that parking spot.

Response: Gilbert Olgin said that the parking space in question was for inventory.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he realizes it wasn't for use by the public and that was why he wondered if they have a different regulation when the use is for inventory parking. He said that overall, he thought the building looked good. He said he is intrigued to see the use of the punched metal. He said the building appears boxy, but they have used materials to give it a good look and depth. He said he thinks the overall design is good.

Question: Joshua Oehler said that there is an ancillary building labeled "future". He wondered if they were asking for approval today, but if it would be added in the future.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said he thought that was still to be determined, but indicated that he would look into it and provide more detail when this case comes before the Commission for Public Hearing.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he thought the applicant had done a wonderful job on the project, using a lot of rich materials. He said there is definition in the mass, so he said he didn't have any comments on the building itself. He said they held the drive further back on the property, so that it isn't as noticeable from the main arterial. He said in previous DRB cases, they have treated those areas as merchandise, so the parking stall isn't a concern to him. He

asked if the building proposed in the future was in addition to the car wash down below on the other property. He said he didn't know how they were crossing the property line with that, so the applicant might want to check with Building regarding that.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that the applicant had explained to him that they would be working with the Building Department to develop the additional building.

Comment: Brian Johns said it is a very good project and well thought out. He looks forward to seeing it come into the Town.

Question: David Cavenee said he had noticed on the color board that there was a cultured stone site wall. He asked if that was a street adjacent site wall or if it was a property related parking screening wall. He said he also noticed that the parking screening is listed as a steel tube security rail. He said he was trying to figure out where the cultured stone would be used, and if it is along the property frontage, he wanted to make sure that it aligns with the Volvo site wall for a consistent look. He said if they were only using a steel tube pipe security rail for parking screening, he is concerned they are not achieving the headlight screening that they would desire against Pecos or Gilbert Roads. He asked if Gilbert Olgin knew the location of the cultured stone wall.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said he did not have that information.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said he would want that to be addressed because the cultured stone does not fit with this architecture. However, he said if it was part of the overall Rivulon development front, then that would be a part of a theme and he could see how it might work. He said he is also concerned with just having a steel tube screen for the headlights. He asked if there was any monumentation at that corner, being that this is kind of a gateway into Gilbert.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that the applicant has proposed monumentation, but that it would be through a separate permit process. He said there is an existing Comprehensive Sign Program that is in place. He shared what they were proposing for the corner, but said they were not proposing any signage for the actual dealership as of yet.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that the monumentation he was referring to would be at the corner. He also sought confirmation that they didn't have any other signage shown in the actual dealership.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered affirmatively to both questions.

Comment: David Cavenee indicated that he had seen place marks in place for possible building signage, indicating that he thought those worked well with the architecture. He said he noticed that the drive entrance off of Pecos doesn't have a deceleration lane. He asked if Staff was at all concerned about that, noting that this was coming right out of a light and there is no escape lane to get out of the traffic to turn in. He said he is certain that Traffic has probably looked at the design, but he said it is a concern to him. He asked that Planner Olgin further check with Traffic about his concern.

Response: Gilbert Olgin indicated that he would do so.

Comment: David Cavenee said he likes the architecture. He feels that the colors chosen are very close to one another, but he feels it is enough differentiation, pointing out that it is a modern, sleek building. He said he likes some of the metal finishes. He said he is in support of the architecture and finishes.

Response: Gilbert Olgin said he feels that the elevations don't do the project justice. He said the project has a certain pop and look to it, but it isn't as evident on the elevation renderings.

Comment: Greg Froehlich asked to see the site plan. He noted at the south end of the cul-de-sac, that there were two parking spots that concerned him. He said as people enter the site, they will not be expecting traffic to back out right there. He said he is also somewhat concerned with another parking spot, in which access has been blocked. He said he feels the spot will have difficulty backing out because they will have to go straight back. He said he would prefer removing this spot and the two spots he had previously mentioned and putting landscape in their location.

Comment: Brian Johns said that historically he has been involved with a lot of the automotive cases. He said that historically they have allowed the pipe rail only because it would showcase the vehicles. He said he would find it unusual to place site walls in the area because it would block the merchandise.

Question: David Cavenee asked where customer parking was located and where showcase parking was located. He said that wherever they had customer parking, if it was in and out with headlights on, he thought they needed to take a look at that.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin indicated the location of the customer parking and the location of the inventory parking.

Comment: Brian Johns said it would be a good idea to check with the applicant, because they usually want their vehicles right up against the street.

Comment: David Cavenee said that because this was Study Session, they could ask the applicant to designate more specifically the two areas used for customer parking and inventory.

Question: Vice Chair Andersen asked to see one of the larger site plans. He called attention to the location of a parking spot, stating that he had figured that the area is approximately 20 feet. He said that Fire Code requires 150' before a turnaround is required. He also noted the location of a walkway which appeared to cut off a car from proceeding further down to turn around. He asked that Planner Olgin get in touch with Fire to discuss this design. He said he believes there are exceptions within the Code where Fire might be able to override a design like this, because there isn't a building in that area. He said that they might be agreeable to allowing the fire truck to back up to get out of that spot, but if not, they would need to redesign the area for the required turnaround.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that Fire had made a similar comment. He said the applicant is aware of this comment and he is curious to see how they address the concern.

3. **GP17-1013 COOLEY STATION PARCELS 9, 11, 17A AND 30: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 35.47 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH AND EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS FROM 14.66 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER, 10.00 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 14-25 DU/ACRE, AND 10.91 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 5-8 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO 35.47 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 5-8 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z17-1023 COOLEY STATION PARCELS 9, 11, 17A AND 30: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1900 AND 2179 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE AND SHOPPING CENTER PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-ROS) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2195 AND 2304 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL 2 PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-2) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2413, 2425, 2443, 2473, 2485, 2496, 2520, 2521, 2563 AND 2612 PERTAINING TO BOTH PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 BY REMOVING FROM THE COOLEY STATION PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 APPROXIMATELY 114.88 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 14.66 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER (GVC), 10.00 ACRES OF MULTI-FAMILY / MEDIUM (MF/M), AND 90.22 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY – DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICTS, ALL WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT, GENERALLY LOCATED AT SOUTH AND EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS; APPROVING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE COOLEY STATION COOLEY STATION PARCEL 9, 11, 17A AND 30 TO APPROXIMATELY 114.88 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY - DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICTS, ALL WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT.**

**S17-1010 COOLEY STATION PARCELS 9, 11, 17A AND 30: REQUEST TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR FULTON HOMES, FOR 594 HOME LOTS (LOTS 1-594) ON APPROXIMATELY 114.8 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH AND EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS IN THE SINGLE FAMILY – DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT.**

**GP17-1015 COOLEY STATION PARCEL 26: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 15.00 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT NORTH AND WEST OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS FROM 15.00 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO 15.00 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z17-1025 COOLEY STATION PARCEL 26: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1900 AND 2179 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE AND SHOPPING CENTER PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-ROS) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2195 AND 2304 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL 2 PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-2) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2413, 2425, 2443, 2473, 2485, 2496, 2520, 2521, 2563 AND 2612 PERTAINING TO BOTH PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 BY REMOVING FROM THE COOLEY STATION PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 APPROXIMATELY 15.00 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS FROM THE COOLEY STATION PAD AND PAD-ROS2 TO APPROXIMATELY 15.00 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) ZONING DISTRICT.**

**GP17-1016 COOLEY STATION PARCEL 27: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 25.33 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT SOUTHEAST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS FROM 15.11 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER, 6.61 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 8-14 DU/ACRE AND 3.61 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 5-8 DU/ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO 25.33 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z17-1026 COOLEY STATION PARCEL 27: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1900 AND 2179 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE AND SHOPPING CENTER PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-ROS) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2195 AND 2304 PERTAINING TO THE COOLEY STATION RESIDENTIAL 2 PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD-2) AND ORDINANCE NOS. 2413, 2425, 2443, 2473, 2485, 2496, 2520, 2521, 2563 AND 2612 PERTAINING TO BOTH PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 BY REMOVING FROM THE COOLEY STATION PAD-ROS AND PAD-2 APPROXIMATELY 25.33 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 15.11 ACRES OF GATEWAY VILLAGE CENTER (GVC) AND 10.22 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY – DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICTS, ALL WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT, GENERALLY LOCATED AT SOUTH AND EAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF RECKER AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROADS; APPROVING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE COOLEY STATION COOLEY STATION PARCEL 27 TO APPROXIMATELY 25.33 GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) ZONING DISTRICTS, ALL WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT.**



Planner Amy Temes began her presentation on GP17-1013, Z17-1023, S17-1010, GP17-1015, Z17-1025, GP17-1016, and Z17-1026. She shared the location of Cooley Station, near Recker and Williams Field Roads, near the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport. She gave some historical background on the project. She said in 2004, a Major General Plan Amendment for 700+ acres was brought forward for the Cooley Station project. She shared that this included the Village Center, indicated in blue on her slide. She noted the location of the Gateway Character Area shown in red. She said this project was a neo-traditional concept within the Gateway Character Area. She pointed out that Cooley Station integrates different zoning products within the area. She said this means there isn't one section of SF-7 right next to SF-6, but they are joined together within the subdivision. She said this development encompasses walkability, pedestrian activity, and encouraging neighbors to come out and enjoy their environment and to be part of their community. Tonight, Planner Temes said they are looking at three cases involving General Plan Amendments, three Rezoning cases (all PAD's), one Preliminary Plat and one Design Review. She also indicated that there would be 20 standard plans before the Commission in the near future.

Planner Temes then stated that she specifically wanted to address Parcel 26 and 27 (shown in red) and Parcels 6, 9, 11, 17A and 30 (shown in yellow). She said this would remove Parcel 26, 27, 6, 9, 11, 17A and 30 from the Cooley Station Planned Area Development (PAD). She said that just because they are PAD's doesn't necessarily mean they are asking for modifications from the Development Standards. However, she stated that because there are some aspects of the PAD (such as specialized cross sections for the Cooley Station area) that would require some changes. Due to this, she said they want to tie it in with the PAD. She said this would revision the Village Center concept that was identified in the original Cooley Station zoning ordinances. She said originally this was envisioned as a downtown, walkable village environment with mixed-use and multi-family and lots of density and intensity. She indicated the future location of a transit station (indicated by a T on the site map) which is in Gilbert's future. She said around transit stations, you often find these Village Center mixed-use environments. She said that was the original goal of Cooley Station. Planner Temes said that the applicant would like Parcel 26 to be conventional zoning. She said the reason it is a PAD was because of Cooley Loop North and Cooley Loop West (indicated by black dashed lines on the map). She said the rest of it would be conventional, General Commercial zoning. She said that the General Plan Amendment would also be looking to go to General Commercial. Regarding Parcel 27, the applicant is asking to remove the Village Center and desires to go to a conventional, General Commercial zoning. The Village Center limited big box uses with a cap of 100,000 square feet. She said they have a potential user that would like to locate on the parcel and they are approximately 125,000 square feet.

Planner Temes said that Parcel 27 goes down into the Fulton Homes subdivision that came before the Commission previously, and will trigger a reconfiguration of the subdivision that was ready to pull permit and break ground. She said this reconfiguration will bring the subdivision up to Williams Field Road, therefore the Village Center and the Multi-Family would be removed and it would be part of the subdivision. She said the Village Center would now be focused to the southwest corner where the future transit location will be located.

In summary, Planner Temes said these cases represent a re-envisioning of the Cooley Station, the Village Center shrinking and moving to the southwest corner, and the other two corners are being proposed as General Commercial (GC). She said there was a Development Agreement that was linked to all the Village Center and the improvements that were done for Williams Field and Recker Road. She said that Development Agreement will have to be modified as this case moves forward. She then discussed the proposed big box store, noting that the potential user is Fry's Marketplace. She said there will also be inline shops and a fueling facility. Planner Temes said it was important that there is pedestrian and bicycle connectivity that allows the neo-traditional flow to come in and out of the shopping center. She said as they move forward with the Design Review application, that the Commission will be seeing next, that they are encouraging storefronts that have active windows. She said they will also be encouraging the use of outdoor patios and gathering spaces. She said they have also discussed architectural character with the applicant and have asked that the architecture be in keeping with the neo-traditional character of the Cooley Station area. She said they hoped to develop retail space and restaurants because there are a lot of people in the neighboring area. She said that two neighborhood meetings had been held. At the first meeting, the attendees were generally in support of a grocery store in this location, as well as restaurant and other support facilities. At the second neighborhood meeting, some residents were concerned that they had bought homes in the area expecting a larger Village Center. The condensing of the Village Center to the southwest corner has caused some concern. She said that Staff will continue to have discussions with the neighbors and bring forward any further comments they receive. Planner Temes then shared the redesign of the southeast corner with the redesigned subdivision, which included two different sizes of alley-loaded homes and conventional, front-loaded lots. She said in most cases, the traditional front-loaded lots face an alley-loaded lot, so she said you would rarely have a double-loaded street of garage faces facing each other. She said they were proposing 594 homes. She requested feedback from the Commission on the neo-traditional concept, the General Plan Amendment, the Rezoning, the overall concept, the Site Plans for the proposed users, as well as the redesign of the Site Plan for the residential.

**At this time, Commissioner Greg Froehlich declared a Conflict of Interest on Item #3.**

Question: David Cavenee asked what was envisioned when they previously approved the Gateway Village Center zoning.

Answer: Amy Temes said a neo-traditional town center concept was envisioned.

Question: David Cavenee asked what that meant.

Answer: Amy Temes said they wanted it to have a mixed-use environment that would be focused on the Recker/Williams Field intersection, and would have intensity and density with the possibility of loft living above, as well as commercial on the first floor, offices and employment around the transit station and all of it would be in support of the transit location.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that in their original envisioning, they wouldn't have been able to have a Fry's.

Answer: Amy Temes said that the maximum development limit was for a 100,000 square foot single user.

Question: David Cavenee asked how large Fry's was.

Answer: Amy Temes stated that Fry's are usually approximately 125,000 square feet.

Comment: David Cavenee said that his concern is that 700 acres of development have been developed and sold with the understanding that they are going to be a Gateway Village Center of that size and that magnitude and will service the existing residents. He said he is a little concerned that they are taking back some of this. He said he understands that Fry's is Commercial and it does provide a retail need to the area, but he is concerned that the applicant is also taking back other chunks with no plan at all, specifically mentioning Parcel 26. He said this has the effect of shrinking the Village Center concept that they sold their development on. He said in terms of a big picture, conceptual approach, it troubles him that this is where they are headed. He said he doesn't have a problem with a Fry's. He thinks they do a great job, considering the nature of the type of big box store that they are. He thinks they make them look very nice and he thinks it could be a good element in this development. But when he steps back and thinks about the overall picture, he has some concerns about the way it has been sold to date.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he has some of the same concerns as Commissioner Cavenee. He said as he has looked at Cooley Station in the years that he has been on the Commission, they have given a lot of different leeways to the development, because they were trying to achieve mixed-use, village feel development. He then mentioned a few of the modifications they had allowed in the past. He said it seems like the applicant keeps asking for more changes and keeps going away from the vision that was originally brought in. He said the idea of retail is not a concern, and he thinks a Fry's could be integrated well (mentioning a similar smaller design of Verrado). He said with this request, parcel 27 could be located anywhere. He said it is just a shopping center with some PAD's on the front and a truck lot on the back. He said he is also concerned that they don't even know what Parcel 26 is, other than that it would be made Commercial. He said he finds this disappointing. He stated that Cooley Station has a lot to build itself into and going this direction sells it a little short.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield said he likes the layout and the plan and where they are headed. He said his comments tonight are not necessarily concentrated on just Cooley Station. He brought up Layton Lakes, noting that they have a commercial piece that is intended to be the Village Center. He said he lives in Higley Groves and that development is also supposed to have a Village Center. He brought up Agritopia, a unique development that has a Village Center. He said these developments are all great, but he wonders how many little mom and pop shops can be successful and sustained in these little Village Centers. He said he thinks about the energy that he was so excited about for the Village Center for the Downtown area and he is excited about that possibility in Cooley Station as well, and he knows that Staff is excited about that possibility as well. He stated that he has seen Cooley Station go on for years, noting that if the Cooley family would have developed this neighborhood in any other fashion, with a more normal density, it would have already sold out and been developed. He said they have a unique opportunity. He said that Planning Staff has held to their guns on what they want Cooley Station to be. He said he doesn't know what the answer is, but he sees all of these little Village Centers and he wonders if they are all sustainable. He said he has some concerns about making changes to Cooley Station, because this is a unique opportunity and the site has the most potential because of the transit station, to become the crown jewel of Gilbert.

Comment: David Cavenee said he would like to get some thoughts from the other commissioners. He said it seems as though the developer has started preliminary talks with Fry's. He said he appreciates the work that has likely gone into that. He said the Fry's would be on the edge of the Village Center. He asked what the other Commissioners felt about allowing a change to be made to Parcel 27, where they would bring it out of Gateway Village Center (GVC) and change it to General Commercial, but not allow them to make a change to Parcel 26. He thought that would address Commissioner Bloomfield's concerns. He asked if the Commission would support his suggestion to allow Parcel 27 to move forward, but keep Parcel 26 as GVC.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he likes the idea of a retail PAD on the retail corner because he thought that half of 27 already had a retail/commercial component.

Response: Amy Temes said this was correct, but it was considered more of a mixed-use Village Center, so it wasn't envisioned to be a standard suburban shopping center in design.

Comment: Joshua Oehler suggested they allow a little more commercial, so they can get to a larger box, but they could encourage the applicant to achieve a little more mix. He said they could request that they push them more into getting the type of retail that was originally envisioned and try to achieve a more integrated mix with more walkability and design than a standard retail center.

Question: David Cavenee asked if he was suggesting pulling in some type of office product into Parcel 27.

Answer: Joshua Oehler said that Office was good, but he said that most shopping centers are service oriented now and offer very few retail stores. He said he believes the design they are suggesting could be anywhere in the valley, and doesn't take into account the unique nature of the area as originally envisioned. He thinks they should be more creative because this is Cooley Station and Cooley Station is more than just your standard development. He also reminded the Commission that they have given a lot to Cooley Station, noting that they have deserved what they have been given, because they have worked hard for the Town. However, he said to chop off this corner and make it a standard shopping center is a disservice to the entire portion of Cooley Station.

Question: Brian Johns stated that Planner Temes had mentioned that there had been some neighborhood meetings. He asked what the outcome of the meetings was and if any comments had come from those meetings.

Answer: Planner Temes said that the first neighborhood meeting was held approximately 1 to 1 ½ years ago and the general feeling at that meeting, was that they were in favor of having a grocery store in the area because they felt that they were lacking services. She said a few people were concerned with losing the Village Center, but the majority of people in attendance at that meeting were in favor. The second meeting was attended by two people and those people were concerned with losing the Village Center, stating that they bought into the area because of that concept. She said she has also received two or three phone calls from people that have heard about the neighborhood meeting and also indicated their concerns about losing the walkability to restaurants and shops and that they liked the idea of living near a little downtown. One mentioned that they hoped their neighborhood would be similar to the Heritage District.

Question: Carl Bloomfield asked how Staff felt about this request.

Answer: Linda Edwards stated that Gilbert has grown tremendously in the last twenty years and along with that, wonderful leaders have come along, like those on the Commission and those on the Town Council. She said all of their tools and processes allow change and that is why the Commission is here – to help Staff make decisions when change occurs. She said change occurs when the demographics in the community want something different or when developers and landowners are pursuing something they desire in an attempt to refit the market and the needs of the market. She said as planners, they appreciate the ideas the Commission has expressed tonight, to maintain a village feel and to maintain the core to a higher density area. However, she said as planners, they also know that sometimes some development spurs more development, so Staff has done the best they can with the proposed change to connect where they think it can connect with neighborhoods, bring development to the street, and try to provide some pedestrian cores. She said that Staff doesn't know the magic number as to how much acreage makes a perfect Village Center, but they have the commitment at this time from the landowner to preserve the southwest corner, which is directly associated with the transit station. She said they love the idea of a Village Center, but it hasn't developed that way yet. She said they are having people express an interest in the southwest corner, so it is just a matter of time before it builds out to what the community wants and needs. She said because there isn't a perfect answer, she really appreciates all of the comments given tonight.

Comment: David Cavenee said it would be his recommendation to go back to the developer and suggest that they allow the change to 27, but that they step back on the change to 26. He said he thought the Commission was in agreement on all of the associated changes with Lot 27.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said within the recommendation, he thought they should suggest taking another look at the site plan from a design perspective and encourage the developer to be creative in achieving a more integrated design. He said the whole idea is to allow families to have walkability so that if they only had one car, they could use the commuter rail system. He said if they decide to allow the changes to 27, they should look at making it more than just a standard shopping center.

Vice Chair Andersen said that he thought there had been some pretty good discussion on that item. He pointed out that they had extended by about 15 minutes over the allotted time for Study Session to end. He said before he recessed the Study Session, they would discuss any changes to the agenda.

## **5. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda**

Vice Chair Andersen asked if there were any changes to the Regular Meeting Agenda. He said that it had been recommended that Item 19, Z16-07, Wireless Communication Facilities, be Continued to the January 3, 2018 meeting. He said it had also been requested that Item 22, Report from Council Liaison on Current Events, be heard earlier in the agenda. He said he would add Item 22 after Item 7, Communication from Citizens.

Vice Chair Andersen said that they had an addendum for Item 10. He asked for a point of clarification if they needed to pull Item 10 off of the Consent Agenda due to the addendum.

Planning Manager Linda Edwards said that they just needed to read it into the record that they had received the addendum to Item 10. After seeing that there were no other changes to the agenda, Vice Chair Andersen recessed the Study Session at 6:15 p.m.

**(At this point in the meeting, the Study Session was recessed)**

Vice Chair Andersen called the Study Session back to order at 8:41 p.m. and called for Item 4, GP17-1014, Layton Lakes Parcel 4.

**4. GP17-1014: LAYTON LAKES PARCEL 4 - REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 21.46 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT NWC OF LINDSAY ROAD AND QUEEN CREEK ROAD FROM SHOPPING CENTER (SC) LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO RESIDENTIAL > 3.5 - 5 DU/ ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z17-1024: LAYTON LAKES PARCEL 4 - REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 21.46 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NWC OF LINDSAY ROAD AND QUEEN CREEK ROAD FROM SHOPPING CENTER (SC) ZONING DISTRICT WITH PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY TO SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

**S17-1011: LAYTON LAKES PARCEL 4 - REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR LAYTON LAKES PARCEL 4 FOR 79 HOME LOTS (LOTS 1-79) ON APPROXIMATELY 21.46 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NWC LINDSAY ROAD AND QUEEN CREEK ROAD IN THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Senior Planner Nathan Williams began his presentation on Item 4, GP17-1014, Z17-1024, S17-1011, Layton Lakes Parcel 4. He said that this involved three concurrent applications for Layton Lakes Parcel 4. The three applications were for a General Plan Amendment, a Rezoning and a Preliminary Plat. He shared the location of the site at the corner of Lindsay and Queen Creek Roads in the Layton Lakes Masterplanned Community. He said the Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification was for approximately 21.46 acres. He stated that the applicant is requesting to change the land use from Shopping Center (SC) to Residential > 3.5 – 5 DU/Acre. The rezoning portion is to change the zoning district from Shopping Center (SC) to Single Family – Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. The Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan is for 79 lots (Lots 1-79) on the site. He shared an aerial map which showed an enlargement of the site, and showed the site's proximity to the corner of Lindsay and Queen Creek Roads. Planner Williams indicated that the blue-dashed line is the line that outlines the Layton Lakes Masterplanned Community in Gilbert. He noted a portion of the Community in the southwest corner of Lindsay and Queen Creek, that belongs to

the City of Chandler. He said there are approximately 1300 residential units in Gilbert. He said most of the units have been built out, except for the Single Family – Detached (SF-D) parcel to the north of this site. He said that parcel had just come before the Commission with a homebuilder that wanted to develop on that parcel. He said that the applicant notes that this is not a suitable commercial site because it is not on a hard corner and it is set back a few hundred feet from the actual corner of Lindsay and Queen Creek Roads. He also said the parcel in question is somewhat irregular shaped and the applicant believes that there are other commercial developments located further to the north, that would make this site not suitable for commercial development.

Planner Williams told the Commission that Staff is not in support of the change in the land use classification and the zoning change from Shopping Center to residential for multiple reasons. He said one of the reasons is due to the fact that this was always planned to be a shopping center piece that would support both Layton Lakes Masterplanned community and the additional 200 acres located in Chandler, as well as other surrounding residential development. He said there is no other commercial development on any of the other corners of this arterial intersection. He showed the highlighted section of his map which indicated a Lift Station which is proposed to be in the back of the commercial center. He also stated that additional commercial development had been lost, due to Chandler rezoning their portion of Layton Lakes from commercial to residential. He said that Staff still feels that this parcel is still a viable piece of commercial property, despite the fact that it isn't on the hard corner. He said that Staff does not want to see a loss of 20+ acres of commercial property and they believe there is always going to be a need for commercially designated parcels for future development.

Planner Williams then discussed some of the constraints of the site in regards to residential. He said the Town's Wastewater Manager had been in touch with him regarding the existing lift station on the parcel. He said they were comfortable with the site being commercial, but they are concerned with residential units being placed on the site. On his map, he indicated areas marked in blue around the lift station, pointing out that those areas were of the most concern. He said there was concern relating to the noises and smells associated with a lift station. He shared an aerial view of the lift station that exists today, pointing out an area in yellow which is the staging area, designated for maintenance trucks and staging of maintenance for the lift station. He said that this staging area would impact the site design. He stated some of the maintenance activities that occur with this lift station: chemical deliveries on a biweekly basis, equipment repairs, generator testing, wet well cleaning and pump control, and preventative maintenance. He also mentioned there are potential odor and noise impacts that could affect surrounding residential homes. He indicated that this particular lift station was much more significant than a typical lift station that exists within some neighborhoods. He provided a graphic which showed the difference between a typical lift station in a neighborhood and this larger type of lift station. He said a typical lift station is designed for 98,000 gallons a day. He mentioned that the Layton Lakes lift station, at average build-out, will be 1.3 million gallons a day. He said the intensity of the lift station would need to be considered in any decision to change this property from Commercial to Residential.

Planner Williams shared the Open Space Plan, noting that the area highlighted in blue was the location of the maintenance area he had previously mentioned. He noted the location of a

secondary access that the applicant had suggested, but indicated that Staff was not supportive of that. He said Staff would, at best, like to see that be emergency access only. He pointed out that the areas in red are those lots that would be most impacted by the lift station. Regarding the overall site design, Staff has been talking to the applicant and has informed the applicant that they don't feel that the site design is well designed at this point. He also said the amenities provided are somewhat underwhelming and don't appear to be enough for this subdivision. He also noted that someone with a lot in the southwestern portion of the site, would be very isolated from the amenities. He said the applicant was providing primary access off of Layton Lakes Boulevard. He said the streets would be public and it wasn't intended to be a gated community. He also noted that along with the rezoning request, the applicant was requesting SF-D, but all the deviations they have requested are in excess of that, meaning they are asking for larger lots than what SF-D would require and limiting the homes to 2-story instead of 3-story which SF-D allows. He said this would mean that they were outside of Town Code for SF-D. He finished his presentation and asked for input from the Commission.

Comment/Question: Carl Bloomfield said that the parcel would appear to have access from the arterial to the east of the parcel and on Layton Lakes Boulevard, but he noted that there doesn't appear to be any access out to Queen Creek on the design before them. He asked if there were any thoughts or concerns about a commercial development not having access out onto Queen Creek. He asked if there would be opportunity to access out onto Lindsay so that there would be some potential. He said Queen Creek doesn't have that big of a traffic yield relative to Lindsay. He specifically noted the potential for Lindsay once the freeway comes in. He said this parcel would have to have access onto Lindsay to be a viable commercial project.

Answer: Nathan Williams said that Queen Creek Road is within Chandler's jurisdiction, so if there would be an access point off of there, they would have to work with Chandler to allow that access point. He said they would have originally liked to have seen access off of Lindsay, but they would have to come up with some kind of agreement from Town Wastewater and Engineering in regards to how bad the staging area would impact whether they could have an access point from Lindsay into the site. He said there are easements that allow general access to the site, but it was his understanding that they would allow residents or customers to drive over that, but he said he didn't know how the maintenance of the area would impact the commercial shopping center.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield said it appeared that they had designed it to have all the gates on one side and it would take some modifications to change it.

Response: Nathan Williams said they designed it so that all the gates were on the southern portion.

Question: Carl Bloomfield asked Nathan Williams if he saw his point, that without access to Lindsay, it wasn't a viable commercial piece either.

Answer: Nathan Williams agreed that either way it would be difficult to design around.

Question: Brian Johns asked to see the large residential map. He noted the location of a lake.

Answer: Nathan Williams said that it was more of a wash situation now, more than a lake.

Question: Carl Bloomfield asked when Layton Lakes was zoned.



Answer: Nathan Williams said it was originally zoned in 2001.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield said that there had been a lot of water under the bridge since that time and that this change may be warranted. He said he always has a concern with taking out commercial and replacing it with residential. He said he knows that there must be a commercial base for the Town to maintain a taxable base and not have property taxes escalate to a point that would be uncomfortable for the Town's residents. He said he isn't normally a fan of this type of change, but he said there occasionally are circumstances where it has made sense for the Town to allow the change. He said he wasn't necessarily opposed to this parcel changing from Commercial to residential. He further shared that he wasn't a fan of the current layout and suggested some changes to the layout.

Question: David Cavenue asked what was located on the other three corners of the intersection.

Answer: Nathan Williams shared what was at the three corners: Phase 1 of Layton Lakes, Phase 2 of Layton Lakes and Chandler's residential portion.

Question: David Cavenue sought to clarify that they didn't have any commercial development in the area.

Answer: Nathan Williams answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenue suggested they might want to look at traffic volumes in the area. He also suggested they plot the closest commercial properties to the area. He said he is compelled by the demand for commercial from what he is seeing in front of him. He said he realizes that there may be other commercial outside of the area that he cannot see, but with what is before him, it looks like the area is going to need commercial development. He said he is also concerned with the lift station. He said the few times he has been around lift stations, he found them to be unpleasant.

Response: Nathan Williams said that there are a number of commercial properties nearby. He said he could provide an enlarged area map that would show the additional commercial properties in the surrounding area.

Comment: David Cavenue said that might help the discussion.

Response: Nathan Williams also mentioned that there was a future planned interchange on Lindsay, so that would increase potential traffic on Lindsay.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said that the interchange would definitely increase traffic on Lindsay. He said they should take that into consideration. He said he would like to see the traffic volumes and the estimated traffic volumes after the interchange is completed. He believes the Lindsay interchange will be taking percentages of traffic from Gilbert Road and from Val Vista. He said he has some of the same concerns that Commissioner Bloomfield had about access for a shopping center, but he said he also would worry about that if it was zoned residential. He said it might be possible to come up with a solution that would work for either zoning. He said the applicant is asking for a dense zoning like SF-D, but then they are asking for bigger lots. He asked why they don't just asked for zoning of Single Family – 6 (SF-6). He asked if that was Staff driven or applicant driven. He said he isn't a big fan of SF-D in the first place, so he wondered why they chose to go that direction.

Answer: Nathan Williams said that the zoning they choose is typically applicant driven. He said they receive a few benefits from SF-D zoning, in terms of setbacks and lot coverage. He said they are proposing the overall density to be around four dwelling units an acre. He said this was originally supposed to be townhomes.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said looking at it as residential, he would like to see about the possibility of going to a higher zoning category like an SF-6 or an SF-7 and asking the applicant to be a little more creative in the design. He also agreed with the Staff that the Open Space Plan needed work, because it was a long walk for a percentage of the neighborhood. He said he would like to see it be more integrated. He said if they were to go to residential, no one would want to be near the lift station, because they smell. He said he would desire to see more reasons why they don't need the shopping center before he would be agreeable to residential zoning. He also stated that he wanted to look at access points and, if residential is considered, how they would achieve being around the lift station.

### **ADJOURN STUDY SESSION**

With no other business before the Commission, Vice Chair Andersen adjourned the Study Session at 9:05 p.m.

---

Brian Andersen, Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary